

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 27, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-23 were pending, allowed claims 5, 11, 18 and 19, and rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17 and 20-23. No claims have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-23 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

On page 2 the Examiner objected to claim 13 has been amended in view of the Examiner's comments.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Haselby. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-10, 12-15, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Ikeda. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 16, 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Haselby and Ikeda.

On page 9 of the Action the Examiner provided comments indicating that there is some confusion over the meaning of the language used in the claims. In a telephone conversation with the Examiner where it was discussed whether an in-person interview would be appropriate this issue was discussed. As discussed with the Examiner, the invention essentially commands two marks be printed at a commanded distance apart ("printing two test marks separated from each other by a **designated error distance** on a printing medium on which images are printed" - claim 1, **bold** emphasis supplied, see also claims 5, 7, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22 and 23). Then the invention measures the actual distance between the marks as printed by using the speed of the carriage and the time at which the marks are detected ("measuring instants of time when the **two test marks are sensed** according to a movement of the carriage; and **detecting an actual error distance** of the two test marks **using the measured instants of time and a moving speed of the carriage**" - claim 1, **bold** emphasis supplied, see also claims 5, 7, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22 and 23). The designated (or commanded) distance and the actual distance are used to correct alignment (see claims 6, 12-14, 16, 18, 19 and 23)

Haselby discusses a system in which a test line is printed at a "predetermined swath position" and the position of the printed test line is determined. The distance relative to the swath position (in association with a reference) is determined and the distance is used to adjust the timing for the printhead cartridges. Although multiple test lines can be printed, they are averaged to get an average position that is used relative to the swath/reference position. There

is no comparison of a designated (or commanded) distance between two marks with an actual measured distance between the two marks taught or suggested by Haselby.

Ikeda discusses a system in vertical and horizontal marks are used with essentially the same technique (see figure 1). A vertical reference mark a-ref1 is printed at a predetermined position and then test marks a-F and a-R are also printed at predetermined positions. That is, Ikeda specifies the positions of the marks made, not the distances between the marks. Then, offsets are determined between the reference mark and the test marks. There is no commanded distance between two marks involved in Ikeda and, as a result, there is no comparison of a designated (or commanded) distance between two marks with an actual measured distance between the two marks taught or suggested by Ikeda.

Combining Haselby with Ikeda would result in printing lines at predetermined positions not lines that are "separated ... by a designated ... distance".

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above.

It is submitted that that claims 5, 11, 18 and 19 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5/29/1

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30, 358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501